

Reply to Office Action dated June 19, 2009

### **REMARKS**

Claims 22-29 and 33-34 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 22, 24, 26, 28, 29 and 33-34 are amended. Various amendments are made for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance; (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and/or (3) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The above amendments are merely for clarity of previously-claimed subject matter. Entry is thus proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

The Office Action rejects claims 22-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,314,466 to Agarawal et al. (hereafter Agarwal) in view of U.S. Patent 6,738,980 to Lin et al. (hereafter Lin), U.S. Patent 6,104,441 to Wee et al. (hereafter Wee) and WO 03/028293 to Aksu et al. (hereafter Aksu). The Office Action also rejects claims 33-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lin in view of Wee and Aksu. The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 22 recites receiving a random access request from a remote unit by a transmitting server, searching a random access point in a content file stored in the transmitting server in response to the transmitting server receiving the random access request, and reconfiguring a data stream according to a screen type of the random access point and a coincidence between the random access point and a data transmission starting point. Independent claim 22 also recites that reconfiguring the data stream comprises: determining an

Reply to Office Action dated June 19, 2009

existing I-frame that is most similar to the random access point when the random access point is determined to be a P-frame and is the data transmission starting point, converting the P-frame into a new I-frame based on values of the existing I-frame and a next P-frame, performing the converting until the next P-frame is the random access point to convert the P-frame random access point into a new I-frame, configuring a media data sample based on the new I-frame as the data transmission starting point, configuring a new data stream using the media data sample and continuous media data samples, and converting a header of the media data sample into a representative header, and transmitting the new data stream including the converted representative header from the transmitting server to the remote unit.

In at least one non-limiting example, FIG. 7 and paragraphs [62] and [66] of the present specification describe that when a random access point is a P-frame, the P-frame is converted into an I-frame. Then, the converted I-frame may be determined as a data transmission starting point. Additionally, a segment header (moof) of a media data sample having the converted I-frame is converted into a representative header (moov).

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 22.

The Office Action (on page 4) cites Aksu as teaching changing a first header information of the new data stream in combination with transmitting the new data stream including the changed first header information from the transmitting server to the remote unit. However, Aksu does not disclose that a segment header (moof) of a media data sample having the converted I-frame is converted into a representative header (moov). More specifically, Aksu does

Reply to Office Action dated June 19, 2009

not teach or suggest converting a header of the media data sample into a representative header, and transmitting the new data stream including the converted representative header from the transmitting server to the remote unit, as recited in independent claim 22.

Agarwal, Lin and Wee do not disclose these missing features of independent claim 22. Thus, independent claim 22 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 33 recites determining an I-frame that is most similar to a P-frame random access point requested by a user, converting a next P-frame that is adjacent to the I-frame into a new I-frame based on information of the next P-frame and the I-frame, configuring a media data sample by setting the converted new I-frame as a data transmission starting point after the converting into the new I-frame, converting a header of the media data sample into a representative header, and transmitting a data stream having the converted header and the configured media data samples.

For at least similar reasons, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 33. More specifically, Aksu (and the other applied references) does not teach or suggest converting a header of the media data sample into a representative header, and transmitting a data stream having the converted header and the configured media data samples. Thus, independent claim 33 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 22 and 33 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the

Reply to Office Action dated June 19, 2009

dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 22-29 and 33-34 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



David C. Oren  
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah

**Date: September 21, 2009**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**